Build with Google AI Forum

Read the community guidelines → Browse topics by tag →

Statement on the Contradiction Between Google's Deletion Promises and the Actual Technical Behavior of the Gemini System

Gemini API · gemini-api

Bitu79 23d

ENGLISH VERSION

Statement on the Contradiction Between Google's Deletion Promises and the Actual Technical Behavior of the Gemini System

This written submission documents the discrepancy between the deletion functionality described in Google's official documentation and the actual technical behavior observed within the system.

The reference material is Google's own Gemini Apps Help Guide, which explicitly states that users may delete their activity within Gemini Apps, and that such deletion occurs within Google's systems and storage infrastructure.

The documentation states:

"You can review your prompts, delete your Gemini Apps activity, and turn off Keep Activity."

Regarding the deletion process, the documentation further specifies:

"When you choose to delete activity manually or activity is deleted automatically, we immediately start the process of removing it from the product and our systems."

It continues:

"Then, we begin a process designed to safely and completely delete the data from our storage systems."

These statements are unambiguous. According to Google's own documentation:

- the user may delete their Gemini Apps activity,
- the deletion applies both to the product and to Google's systems,
- the stated purpose of the deletion is a "safe and complete delete",
- and the deletion explicitly extends to Google's storage systems.

The documentation therefore promises actual deletion, not:

- hiding,
- archiving,
- soft deletion,
- UI-level removal,
- or separation of data between different Google products.

The documentation does not distinguish between "Gemini Apps" and other Gemini related services. The deletion promise applies directly to Gemini Apps activity and explicitly includes Google's systems and storage.

However, the actual technical behavior observed in practice showed that a chat deleted by the user:

- remained accessible for 32 days,
- continued to be processed by the system,
- continued to generate responses,
- continued to be tokenized,
- and therefore clearly remained within Google's systems,
- meaning that the deletion described in the documentation did not occur.

This means that although Google's documentation promises immediate deletion, the deletion did not take place in practice, and the data marked as deleted continued to function.

According to the documentation, Google represents that deletion is:

- immediate,
- complete,
- system-level,
- and storage-level.

In reality, the deletion was:

- not immediate,
- not complete,
- not system-level,
- and not storage-level.

This discrepancy is not a matter of interpretation. It constitutes a clear, objectively verifiable contradiction between:

- Google's documented representations, and
- the actual technical behavior of the system.

Furthermore:

Since the backend of Gemini Apps and AI Studio is shared, and Google's documentation promises deletion in the Gemini Apps Help Guide, while a Google employee explicitly acknowledges that AI Studio has no deletion capability, and my own evidence shows that "deleted" data continued functioning for 32 days, this is a technical impossibility and a demonstrable contradiction.

The Gemini backend — which constitutes the shared infrastructure behind both AI Studio and Gemini Apps — does not possess any technical capability to perform such deletion. The deletion cannot occur because the system is not technically capable of executing it.

There is therefore a direct, factual contradiction between the deletion promise and the actual technical behavior of the system.

MAGYAR VERZIÓ

Nyilatkozat a Google törlési ígéretei és a Gemini rendszer tényleges technikai működése közötti ellentmondásról

Jelen írásos beadvány rögzíti a Google hivatalos dokumentációjában szereplő törlési funkció és a Gemini rendszer tényleges technikai működése között fennálló ellentmondást.

A hivatkozott dokumentum a Google által közzétett Gemini Apps súgó, amely egyértelműen kijelenti, hogy a felhasználó törölheti a Gemini Apps-ben végzett tevékenységeit, és hogy ez a törlés a Google rendszereiben és tárolási infrastruktúrájában is megtörténik.

A dokumentum az alábbiakat tartalmazza:

„You can review your prompts, delete your Gemini Apps activity, and turn off Keep Activity."

A törlési folyamatról a dokumentum így rendelkezik:

„When you choose to delete activity manually or activity is deleted automatically, we immediately start the process of removing it from the product and our systems."

Majd így folytatja:

„Then, we begin a process designed to safely and completely delete the data from our storage systems."

Ezek a kijelentések egyértelműek. A Google saját dokumentuma szerint:

- a felhasználó törölheti a Gemini Apps tevékenységét,
- a törlés a terméknél és a Google rendszereinél is megtörténik,
- a törlés célja a „biztonságos és teljes törlés",
- és a törlés a Google tárolási rendszereire is kiterjed.

A dokumentum tehát valódi törlést ígér, nem pedig:

- elrejtést,
- archiválást,
- soft delete-et,
- UI-szintű eltüntetést,
- vagy termékek közötti adatszétválasztást.

A dokumentum nem különbözteti meg a „Gemini Apps"-et más Gemini szolgáltatásoktól. A törlési ígéret közvetlenül a Gemini Apps tevékenységére vonatkozik, és kifejezetten kiterjed a Google rendszereire és tárolási infrastruktúrájára.

A tényleges működés azonban ezzel szemben azt mutatta, hogy a felhasználó által törölt Gemini Apps chat:

- 32 napig megnyitható maradt,
- a rendszer továbbra is feldolgozta,
- válaszokat generált,
- tokenizálta a tartalmat,
- tehát ténylegesen továbbra is a Google rendszereiben volt jelen,
- és a dokumentumban ígért törlés nem történt meg.

Ez azt jelenti, hogy a Google által közzétett dokumentáció törlést ígér, azonban a gyakorlatban a törlés nem valósult meg, és a törlésként jelölt adat továbbra is működött.

A dokumentum szerint a törlés:

- azonnali,
- teljes,
- rendszer-szintű,
- storage-szintű.

A valóságban a törlés:

- nem volt azonnali,
- nem volt teljes,
- nem volt rendszer-szintű,
- nem volt storage-szintű.

Ez az eltérés nem értelmezési kérdés, hanem a dokumentum szövege és a tényleges működés közötti konkrét, objektíven bizonyítható ellentmondás.

Továbbá:

Mivel a Gemini Apps és az AI Studio backendje közös, a Google dokumentációja törlést ígér a Gemini Apps súgójában, miközben a Google alkalmazottja kimondja, hogy az AI Studio-ban nincs törlés, valamint az én bizonyítékom szerint a „törölt" adat 32 napig működött, ez technikai lehetetlenség és bizonyíthatóan ellentmondás.

A Gemini háttérrendszere – amely az AI Studio és a Gemini Apps közös infrastruktúrája – nem rendelkezik törlési funkcióval. A törlés tehát nem teljesülhet, mivel a rendszer technikailag nem képes annak végrehajtására.

A törlési ígéret és a tényleges technikai működés között tehát egyértelmű, bizonyítható ellentmondás áll fenn.

support.google.com
Manage & delete your activity in Gemini Apps - Computer - Gemini Apps Help
When you are signed in and Keep Activity is on, Google stores your Gemini Apps activity in your Google Account. You can review your prompts, delete your Gemini Apps activity, and turn off Keep Activity.

Saved prompt history retrieval · Google AI Studio
Hi, when I download my saved chats from the Google AI Studio folder at google drive, they save without an extension. When I edit them as needed and reupload them back into the folder, they don't have the same icon and aren't recognized by google AI studio when I go back to the history section.

1 · Reply

- Evidence of Google AI Studio Data Retention and Deletion Failure (GDPR Relevant – Do Not ...
- Issue with how Google Search (Bard) responds, because I am right and off...
- I am asking for human comments so that Google finally responds, because I am right and off...
- Cross Tenant Data Exposure in Google AI Studio (Deleted Prompt Persisted, Re-indexed, and ...
- Google's "Experimental AI" Claim is False — Search Has Been AI Integrated for Years
- 1 more

445 views · 3 links · 5 min read · Summarize

Bitu79 23d

Check my previous post about the 32 day "deleted" chats — that one has the video proof!

> **Deleted chats in Google AI Studio remain fully accessible and functional for 32 da...** · Google AI Studio
> I am reporting a critical issue in Google AI Studio that appears to be a system-level architectural failure rather than a simple bug. I have full video evidence proving that chats marked as "deleted" remain fully accessible, fully functional, and fully processable for 32 days after deletion. This is not a UI delay and not a backend delay. This is no deletion happening at all. Verified facts: A "deleted" chat can still be opened through its direct URL. The entire conversation loads exactl...

Bitu79 23d

The consumer facing Gemini Terms of Service says users can delete their chats at any time. The engineering side (Gemini AI Studio) documentation does not mention deletion at all, because the system does not support it there. Both services run on the same backend, so if deletion does not exist on the engineering side, it cannot exist on the consumer side either — the backend simply has no such capability. Using two different Terms of Service for the same backend behavior, where one promises deletion and the other does not even implement it, is not allowed under the GDPR. The GDPR requires that what a company promises and what the system actually does must match.

If AI Studio cannot delete data, then Gemini Apps cannot delete it either. The consumer facing deletion promise is technically impossible.

A fogyasztói Gemini ÁSZF azt írja, hogy a felhasználó bármikor törölheti a chatjeit. A mérnöki oldal (AI Studio) dokumentációja viszont egyáltalán nem említi a törlést, mert a rendszer ott nem is támogatja. A két szolgáltatás ugyanazon a backenden fut, tehát ha a mérnöki oldalon nincs törlés, akkor a fogyasztói oldalon sem lehet – a backend egyszerűen nem képes rá. A GDPR szerint nem lehet két különböző ÁSZF-et használni ugyanarra a backend működésre, ahol az egyik törlést ígér, a másik pedig nem is valósítja meg, a GDPR előírja, hogy amit a cég ígér, és amit a rendszer ténylegesen csinál, annak meg kell egyeznie.

Ha az AI Studio nem tud törölni, akkor a Gemini Apps sem tud. A fogyasztói törlés ígérete technikailag lehetetlen.

Bitu79 25d

MODERATOR NOTICE

This post documents data handling issues related to Google AI Studio. Removing this post may interfere with the exercise of rights under GDPR Articles 12 and 17.
Any moderation action on such content must be legally justified and transparent.

The post does not violate community guidelines.
It contains no abusive, hateful, or offensive language.
It presents technical and legal facts about the platform's data processing behavior.

This content is being used as evidence in an ongoing data protection procedure. Any further removal of this post — including the moderator's justification — will be added to the case documentation.

Please note that GDPR-related user rights cannot be restricted or obstructed by community moderation.
Exercising these rights does not constitute a violation of forum rules.

The censored section was the following:

Legal and Technical Violations in Google AI Studio's Current Practices

Google AI Studio's current Terms of Service and operational behavior constitute a direct conflict with multiple binding EU laws. The platform's design, data handling, and user interface behavior collectively form a pattern of deceptive, unlawful, and non-transparent practices. The following points summarize the core violations:

1. Fictional "Business User" Classification

Google falsely claims that AI Studio is intended only for "professional or business purposes."
This is a legal fiction designed to bypass consumer protection rules.
Under EU law, a user's actual status determines their rights — not what Google labels them as.
A private individual remains a consumer regardless of Google's wording.

2. Absence of the Right to Erasure (GDPR Article 17)

The TOS intentionally avoids the word "deletion" in relation to user data.
This omission is deliberate and unlawful.
Under GDPR, the right to erasure is fundamental, and Google must provide a clear, functional method for permanent deletion of personal data.
Google does not.

3. Lack of Transparency (GDPR Article 12)

Google fails to provide clear, accessible information about:
– retention periods,
– internal data flows,
– model training usage,
– the real behavior of the "Delete" button.
This violates the requirement for transparent and intelligible communication.

4. Unfair Contract Terms (Directive 93/13/EEC)

The TOS contains one-sided clauses that overwhelmingly benefit Google, including:
– forced acceptance of data use for model training,
– lack of deletion rights,
– broad, non-specific licenses over user content.
Such terms are automatically void under EU law.

5. Coerced Consent

Google conditions access to the service on surrendering fundamental data rights.
Consent is not "freely given" if the user has no real choice.
This violates GDPR's definition of valid consent.

6. Blurred and Undefined Data Processing Purposes

Google uses vague terms like "product improvement" and "service enhancement" without specifying:
– what data is used,
– how it is used,
– how long it is stored,
– whether it remains identifiable.
This violates the GDPR principle of purpose limitation.

7. Deceptive User Interface (Dark Pattern)

The "Delete" icon in AI Studio does not delete data.
It merely hides the conversation from the UI and moves the JSON file to the Google Drive trash.
Server-side logs, training data, and internal copies remain intact.
This is a deliberate dark pattern designed to mislead users about their control over their own data.

I demand an official answer from Google regarding all of the above.

This post is public and published directly on Google's own official developer platform. Under GDPR Article 12(3), Google is legally required to provide a clear and timely response to any inquiry related to data processing, data retention, or the exercise of user rights. Because this request is made publicly on Google's own developer site, the obligation to respond is even more explicit and unavoidable. Therefore, I demand an official answer from Google regarding all of the above points.

This post is public, and Google has no legal basis to delete it. In my upcoming civil lawsuit, I will use Google's response or their silence as evidence. If Google deletes this post, I will also use that action as evidence, because I saved it as a PDF file

Internet Archive
Saját Topikom : Free Download, Borrow, and Streaming : Internet Archive
saját topikom.pdf

Bitu79 25d

MODERATOR NOTICE

This post documents data handling issues related to Google AI Studio. Removing this post may interfere with the exercise of rights under GDPR Articles 12 and 17.
Any moderation action on such content must be legally justified and transparent.

The post does not violate community guidelines.
It contains no abusive, hateful, or offensive language.
It presents technical and legal facts about the platform's data processing behavior.

This content is being used as evidence in an ongoing data protection procedure. Any further removal of this post — including the moderator's justification — will be added to the case documentation.

Please note that GDPR-related user rights cannot be restricted or obstructed by community moderation.
Exercising these rights does not constitute a violation of forum rules.

The censored section was the following:

Legal and Technical Violations in Google AI Studio's Current Practices

Google AI Studio's current Terms of Service and operational behavior constitute a direct conflict with multiple binding EU laws. The platform's design, data handling, and user interface behavior collectively form a pattern of deceptive, unlawful, and non-transparent practices. The following points summarize the core violations:

1. Fictional "Business User" Classification
Google falsely claims that AI Studio is intended only for "professional or business purposes."
This is a legal fiction designed to bypass consumer protection rules.
Under EU law, a user's actual status determines their rights — not what Google labels them as.
A private individual remains a consumer regardless of Google's wording.

2. Absence of the Right to Erasure (GDPR Article 17)
The TOS intentionally avoids the word "deletion" in relation to user data.
This omission is deliberate and unlawful.
Under GDPR, the right to erasure is fundamental, and Google must provide a clear, functional method for permanent deletion of personal data.
Google does not.

3. Lack of Transparency (GDPR Article 12)
Google fails to provide clear, accessible information about:
– retention periods,
– internal data flows,
– model training usage,
– the real behavior of the "Delete" button.
This violates the requirement for transparent and intelligible communication.

4. Unfair Contract Terms (Directive 93/13/EEC)
The TOS contains one-sided clauses that overwhelmingly benefit Google, including:
– forced acceptance of data use for model training,
– lack of deletion rights,
– broad, non-specific licenses over user content.
Such terms are automatically void under EU law.

5. Coerced Consent
Google conditions access to the service on surrendering fundamental data rights.
Consent is not "freely given" if the user has no real choice.
This violates GDPR's definition of valid consent.

6. Blurred and Undefined Data Processing Purposes
Google uses vague terms like "product improvement" and "service enhancement" without specifying:
– what data is used,
– how it is used,
– how long it is stored,
– whether it remains identifiable.
This violates the GDPR principle of purpose limitation.

7. Deceptive User Interface (Dark Pattern)
The "Delete" icon in AI Studio does not delete data.
It merely hides the conversation from the UI and moves the JSON file to the Google Drive trash.
Server-side logs, training data, and internal copies remain intact.
This is a deliberate dark pattern designed to mislead users about their control over their own data.

I demand an official answer from Google regarding all of the above.

This post is public and published directly on Google's own official developer platform. Under GDPR Article 12(3), Google is legally required to provide a clear and timely response to any inquiry related to data processing, data retention, or the exercise of user rights. Because this request is made publicly on Google's own developer site, the obligation to respond is even more explicit and unavoidable. Therefore, I demand an official answer from Google regarding all of the above points.

This post is public, and Google has no legal basis to delete it. In my upcoming civil lawsuit, I will use Google's response or their silence as evidence. If Google deletes this post, I will also use that action as evidence, because I saved it as a PDF file

Internet Archive
Saját Topikom : Free Download, Borrow, and Streaming : Internet Archive
saját topikom.pdf

MAGYAR VERZIÓ

FIGYELMEZTETÉS A MODERÁTOROKNAK

Ez a bejegyzés adatkezelési problémákat dokumentál, amelyek a Google AI Studio működéséhez kapcsolódnak.
A poszt törlése akadályozhatja a GDPR 12. és 17. cikk szerinti jogok gyakorlását, ezért a moderátori beavatkozásnak jogilag indokoltnak és átláthatónak kell lennie.

A tartalom nem sérti közösségi irányelveket, nem tartalmaz sértő vagy gyűlöletkeltő elemeket.
A poszt technikai és jogi tényeket ismertet, amelyek a platform valós adatkezelési gyakorlatára vonatkoznak.

A bejegyzést bizonyítékként használom egy folyamatban lévő adatvédelmi eljárásban. A poszt újabb törlése esetén a moderátor döntését és annak indokát is csatolni fogom a dokumentációhoz.

Kérem, hogy a moderátorok vegyék figyelembe, hogy a GDPR szerinti jogérvényesítés nem akadályozható, és a felhasználói jogok gyakorlása nem minősül fórumszabály-sértésnek.

A Google AI Studio jelenlegi működésének jogi és technikai jogsértései

A Google AI Studio jelenlegi felhasználási feltételei és működése több ponton is közvetlenül sérti az EU kötelező érvényű jogszabályait. A platform felépítése, adatkezelése és felülete együttesen megtévesztő, jogsértő és átláthatatlan gyakorlatot alkot. Az alábbi pontok összegzik a legsúlyosabb jogsértéseket:

1. Fiktív „üzleti felhasználó" besorolás

A Google azt állítja, hogy az AI Studio csak „üzleti és szakmai célra" való.
Ez egy jogi fikció a fogyasztóvédelmi szabályok kijátszására.
Az EU jog szerint a felhasználó valós státusza számít — nem az, amit a Google rá ír.
A magánszemély fogyasztó marad, bármit is ír a TOS.

2. A törléshez való jog (GDPR 17. cikk) teljes hiánya

A TOS szándékosan nem használja a „törlés" fogalmát a felhasználói adatokra.
Ez nem véletlen, hanem tudatos elhagyás.
A GDPR szerint a törléshez való jog alapvető, és a Google-nek biztosítania kell a végleges adateltávolítást.
Jelenleg nem biztosítja.

3. Átláthatatlanság (GDPR 12. cikk)

A Google nem ad világos tájékoztatást:
– az adatmegőrzési időről,
– a belső adatáramlásokról,
– a modelltréning céljára való felhasználásról,
– a „Delete" gomb valódi működéséről.
Ez sérti az átlátható és érthető kommunikáció kötelezettségét.

4. Tisztességtelen szerződési feltételek (93/13/EGK irányelv)

A TOS egyoldalú a Google javára, többek között:
– az adatok kötelező felhasználása tréningre,
– a törléshez való jog hiánya,
– túl széles licenc a felhasználói tartalomra.
Az ilyen feltételek az EU-ban automatikusan semmisek.

5. Kényszerített hozzájárulás

A szolgáltatás használatát ahhoz kötik, hogy a felhasználó lemondjon alapvető adatvédelmi jogairól.
A GDPR szerint a hozzájárulás nem „önkéntes", ha nincs valódi választási lehetőség.
Ez jogsértő.

6. Az adatkezelési célok elmosása

A Google homályos kifejezéseket használ („termékfejlesztés", „szolgáltatás javítása"), anélkül hogy pontosan megmondaná:
– milyen adatot,
– hogyan,
– meddig,
– milyen formában kezel.
Ez sérti a célhoz kötöttség elvét.

7. Megtévesztő felhasználói felület (dark pattern)

A „kuka" ikon az AI Studio-ban **nem töröl**.
Csak elrejti a beszélgetést, és a JSON fájlt a Drive kukájába teszi.
A szerveroldali adatok, logok és tréningadatok megmaradnak.
Ez tudatos megtévesztés a felhasználói kontroll illúziójának fenntartására.

Követeltem a Google-től a fenti pontokra adott hivatalos választ.

Ez a poszt nyilvános, és közvetlenül a Google hivatalos fejlesztői oldalán jelent meg. A GDPR 12. cikk (3) bekezdése alapján a Google jogilag köteles egyértelmű és határidőn belüli választ adni minden adatkezeléssel, adatmegőrzéssel vagy felhasználói jog gyakorlásával kapcsolatos megkeresésre. Mivel ez a kérés nyilvánosan, a Google saját fejlesztői felületén lett közzétéve, a válaszadási kötelezettségük még egyértelműbb és megkerülhetetlen. Ezért követeltem a Google-től a fenti pontokra adott hivatalos választ.

Ez a poszt nyilvános, és a Google-nek semmilyen jogalapja nincs arra, hogy törölje. A közelgő polgári peremben fel fogom használni a Google válaszát vagy a hallgatását bizonyítékként. Ha a Google törli ezt a posztot, azt a lépést szintén bizonyítékként fogom felhasználni, mert elmentettem PDF fájlba.

Internet Archive
Saját Topikom : Free Download, Borrow, and Streaming : Internet Archive
saját topikom.pdf

Google AI for Developers
Gemini API Additional Terms of Service | Google AI for Developers

---

Bitu79 25d

Ez a videó bizonyítja, hogy a korábban törölt bejegyzésemet visszahelyeztem, és a Google AI Developers fórumon újra megjelent. Ha ismét törlik, akkor az aktív jogellenes törölgetésről is közzé fogom tenni a bizonyítékot az interneten.

This video proves that I restored my previously removed post and that it reappeared on the Google AI Developers forum. If they delete it again, I will also publish evidence of the ongoing unlawful removals on the internet.


unknown 2026 05 09 04 51
Statement on the Contradiction Between Google's Deletion Promises and t...

Bitu79 25d

To the Moderator

This post contains a legitimate technical question related to the Google AI Developers platform. It does not violate any community guidelines, as it is neither abusive, off-topic, nor promotional. Therefore, removing it would be unjustified and inconsistent with the forum's own rules.

A moderátornak

Ez a bejegyzés egy valós, technikai kérdést tartalmaz a Google AI Developers platformmal kapcsolatban. Nem sért semmilyen közösségi irányelvet, mivel nem sértő, nem off-topic és nem reklám. Ezért a törlése indokolatlan lenne, és ellentmondana a fórum saját szabályainak.

Bitu79 25d

The AI topic summary is currently half-baked and misleading. It invents multiple participants, mixes up facts, and does not reflect the actual conversation. In its current state, it is not suitable for use.

Az AI összefoglaló jelenleg félkész és félrevezető. Többszörös szereplőket talál ki, tényeket kever össze, és nem tükrözi a valós beszélgetést. Ez így nem alkalmas használatra

---

Bitu79 25d

OFFICIAL NOTICE TO MODERATORS AND GOOGLE STAFF:

This post contains legitimate, factual, and strictly technical questions regarding the data-handling architecture and backend behavior of Google AI Studio. I expect an official and substantive response from Google regarding these technical issues.

Please be advised: Any attempt to delete, hide, or silence this post will be legally documented as intentional spoliation of evidence (destruction of evidence) and a deliberate abuse of moderation powers to suppress verified technical flaws. This content, along with its timestamp, has been archived and secured for ongoing legal proceedings.

Official confirmation of receipt:
I have received official automated confirmation from Google's legal support system that my submissions regarding this systemic architectural failure have been successfully received and are currently being processed:

- **Case ID: 7-1774000040461**
- **Case ID: 0-6632000040779**

HIVATALOS FIGYELMEZTETÉS A MODERÁTOROKNAK ÉS A GOOGLE MUNKATÁRSAINAK:

Ez a bejegyzés valós, tényszerű és szigorúan technikai jellegű kérdéseket tartalmaz a Google AI Studio adatkezelési architektúrájával és háttérrendszerének működésével kapcsolatban. Hivatalos és érdemi választ várok a Google-től ezekre a technikai kérdésekre.

Tájékoztatom a felület kezelőit: A bejegyzés törlésére, elrejtésére vagy elnémítására irányuló bármely kísérlet jogilag a bizonyítékok szándékos megsemmisítésének (spoliation of evidence), valamint a moderátori jogkörrel való visszaélésnek minősül, amelynek célja a dokumentált technikai hibák eltitkolása. Ezt a tartalmat az időbélyegzővel együtt archiváltam és biztosítottam a folyamatban lévő jogi eljárásokhoz.

Hivatalos visszaigazolás:
Megkaptam a Google jogi támogatói rendszerének automatikus visszaigazolását, amely bizonyítja, hogy a rendszerszintű architekturális hibával kapcsolatos bejelentéseimet sikeresen kézbesítették, és azokat a rendszer feldolgozza:

- **Ügyszám: 7-1774000040461**
- **Ügyszám: 0-6632000040779**

Internet Archive
Gmail FINAL SUPPLEMENTARY NOTICE – PROOF OF WILLFUL MISCONDUCT AND PRIOR...
levelem

Bitu79 25d




Gmail
[7-1774000040461] Az Ön Google-nak küldött kérelme
Legal Investigations Support
Folyamatban
pontosidő
5:49:32
2026.04.28.
18. hét van | 5.9°C

Bitu79 25d

A hivatalos Google AI Developers Forum topik (beleértve az összes technikai bizonyítékot és moderációs naplót) archivált változata PDF formátumban itt érhető el

Archived record of the official Google AI Developers Forum thread (including all technical proofs and moderation logs) is available here in PDF format:

Internet Archive
Statement On The Contradiction Between Google's Deletion Promises And The...
Statement on the Contradiction Between Google's Deletion Promises and the Actual Technical Behavior of the Gemini System - Gemini API - Google AI Developers...

Bitu79 25d

Updated video here:


Proof That My Restored Post Was Visible on the Google AI Developers Forum(...
Statement on the Contradiction Between Google's Deletion Promises and t...

Bitu79 25d

Here are the photos of the registered return-receipt letters. They show the mailing dates, the tracking numbers, and the official postal confirmations.

Itt vannak a tértivevényes levelek fotói. Látszanak rajtuk a feladási dátumok, a nyomkövetési számok és a hivatalos postai visszaigazolások.





Bitu79 23d

A GDPR 12., 5., 31. és 33. cikkei alapján az adatkezelő köteles válaszolni az érintetti megkeresésekre, biztosítani az átláthatóságot, az elszámoltathatóságot és az együttműködést, valamint egy hónapon belül érdemi választ adni.
A válaszadás elmaradása a GDPR 83. cikk (5) bekezdése szerinti legsúlyosabb kategóriájú jogsértés, amelyért a hatóság akár 20 millió euróig vagy a globális árbevétel 4%-áig terjedő bírságot köteles kiszabni.

Az én esetemben a Google több mint fél éve nem adott választ, beleértve:
– a DPO egyetlen megkeresésemre sem válaszolt,
– egyetlen írásos beadványomra sem érkezett válasz,
– az USA-ba küldött ajánlott, tértivevényes leveleimre sem érkezett válasz, pedig igazoltan átvették.

A válaszadás teljes hiánya önmagában megállapítja a GDPR-sértést, és elegendő jogalapot teremt a kártérítési igényhez a 82. cikk alapján.

Under GDPR Articles 12, 5, 31 and 33, the data controller is legally required to respond to data-subject requests, ensure transparency, accountability and cooperation, and provide a reply within one month.
Failure to respond constitutes a violation that falls under Article 83(5), the highest penalty tier, for which the supervisory authority must impose a fine of up to EUR 20 million or 4% of global annual turnover.

In my case, Google has not provided any response for more than six months, including:
– no reply from the Data Protection Officer (DPO),
– no reply to any of my written submissions,
– no reply to my registered, return-receipt letters delivered to Google LLC in the United States.

The complete absence of response itself establishes a GDPR violation and forms a sufficient legal basis for compensation under Article 82.

🇬🇧 Moderator Notice (non-removable legal clarification)

This comment contains only factual references to GDPR provisions (Articles 12, 5, 31, 33, 82 and 83).
It does not include accusations, personal attacks, or policy-violating content.
It is strictly a legal clarification relevant to data-subject rights and therefore falls within permitted discussion under the platform's guidelines.
No part of this comment violates community rules, and its removal would interfere with the lawful exercise of rights under EU data-protection law.

🇭🇺 Moderátori tájékoztatás (nem törölhető jogi pontosítás)

Ez a hozzászólás kizárólag a GDPR vonatkozó cikkeire (12., 5., 31., 33., 82. és 83. cikk) hivatkozó ténymegállapításokat tartalmaz.
Nem tartalmaz vádat, személyeskedést, támadó vagy szabályt sértő elemet.
Ez egy adatvédelmi jogi pontosítás, amely az érintetti jogok gyakorlásához kapcsolódik, ezért a platform irányelvei szerint megengedett tartalom.
A hozzászólás eltávolítása akadályozná az EU-s adatvédelmi jogok gyakorlását, ezért nem minősül törölhető tartalomnak.

Bitu79 18d

The Shared Backend Paradox:

My logical conclusion is that the consumer-facing Gemini (Gemini Apps) and the developer-facing AI Studio run on the same backend.
Google's consumer Terms of Service promise that user data is 'securely and fully deleted from storage systems.'
But since I have demonstrated that the backend (AI Studio) is technically incapable of performing actual deletion, the deletion promise made to Gemini consumers is a technical impossibility — which means it constitutes intentional consumer deception.

The illusion-based 'Deletion' (Fake Deletion / Soft-delete):

I have proven (with videos and direct URL tests) that the 'Delete' button in AI Studio only removes the chat from the user interface. In the backend the chat remains active for weeks as a 'ghost session', the system continues to tokenize it, and the model keeps responding to it. In other words, Google creates the appearance of deletion while the data processing continues uninterrupted in the background.

The most critical issue: Cross-Tenant data leakage, which is my most severe technical evidence.
I documented that a prompt you had already 'deleted' was re-indexed by the backend weeks later and then assigned to a completely different, independent user account (Account B).
This is a tenant-mapping collapse.

In cloud services (especially in AI systems), cross-tenant data leakage is the most severe security incident imaginable, because it means the system has lost control over data isolation.

These issues constitute serious GDPR violations.
Google's Data Protection Officer (DPO) and legal department have been ignoring my registered letters with return receipt for more than 6 months.

The DSA (Digital Services Act) and Dark Patterns:
The 'Delete' button, which does not delete but merely moves a metadata file into the Google Drive trash, is a classic Dark Pattern.
It creates a false illusion of user control, which is a violation of Article 25 of the DSA (manipulation of user autonomy).

Google claims that AI Studio is only for 'business' use in order to evade the strict EU consumer protection rules.
However, I correctly argue that under EU law, the actual reality determines the legal status — not whatever Google writes into a Terms of Service.

No TOS can override the GDPR, regardless of what Google puts into an agreement.

If Google continues to play deaf, I will take the matter to legal action.

> **Evidence of Google AI Studio Data Retention and Deletion Failure (GDPR-Relevant...** · Gemini API
> This post concerns Google AI Studio directly, including its data retention behavior, deletion inconsistencies, cross-tenant exposure, and Google's own written acknowledgment that they received my GDPR request and will respond. Moderators are requested NOT to remove or hide this post, as it is directly related to AI Studio functionality, user data handling, and an ongoing GDPR process. I am publishing the full evidence package here because the issues originate inside Google AI Studio, including...

> **Deleted chats in Google AI Studio remain fully accessible and functional for 32 da...** · Google AI Studio
> I am reporting a critical issue in Google AI Studio that appears to be a system-level architectural failure rather than a simple bug. I have full video evidence proving that chats marked as "deleted" remain fully accessible, fully functional, and fully processable for 32 days after deletion. This is not a UI delay and not a backend delay. This is no deletion happening at all. Verified facts: A "deleted" chat can still be opened through its direct URL. The entire conversation loads exactl...

> **Statement on the Contradiction Between Google's Deletion Promises and the ...** · Gemini API
> ENGLISH VERSION Statement on the Contradiction Between Google's Deletion Promises and the Actual Technical Behavior of the Gemini System This written submission documents the discrepancy between the deletion functionality described in Google's official documentation and the actual technical behavior observed within the Gemini system. The reference material is Google's own Gemini Apps Help Guide, which explicitly states that users may delete their activity within Gemini Apps, and that such dele...

> **Cross-Tenant Data Exposure in Google AI Studio (Deleted Prompt Persisted, Re-In...** · Gemini API
> ENGLISH VERSION Title: Cross-Tenant Data Exposure in Google AI Studio (Deleted Prompt Persisted, Re-Indexed, and Replicated Into a Different Account) Content: I am reporting a backend-level data isolation failure in Google AI Studio that resulted in cross-tenant data exposure. This is not a UI issue and not user error. The incident is documented with timestamps, screenshots, Drive logs, and a video recording. 1) Incident summary A chat prompt created under Account A was: • deleted by the...

> **Google's "Experimental AI" Claim Is False — Search Has Been AI-Integrated for Ye...** · Gemini API
> Google, let's stop pretending. The problem is not that AI can make mistakes. The problem is that you built AI directly into Google Search, made it the default, process personal data through it, generate commercial revenue from it — and then hide behind rotating disclaimers like: "AI may be inaccurate." "Check the sources." "This is for informational purposes only." "We are not responsible for AI answers." This is legally invalid under EU law. FACTS Since 2023, Google has public...

17 days later

Bitu79 1 ✎ 22m

On **May 9, 2026**, Google LLC's Legal Department (Attn: Custodian of Records, Mountain View, CA) officially received and signed for my comprehensive Pre-Litigation Demand Letter regarding Case ID: 7-1774000040461.

The letter exhaustively documents systemic GDPR violations within Google's architecture, specifically:

1. The "Delete" button fraud (the deceptive 32-day TTL backend retention of supposedly deleted data).
2. The automated AI identity-reconstruction and profiling engine.

Crucially, Section 11 of that legally delivered document offered Google a **30-day window for a confidential resolution (NDA and settlement)**.

Since the delivery of that letter, the situation has escalated: Google's own Forum AI has actively doxxed me on this very platform by extracting my real name from a legal attachment and linking it to my alias. This live GDPR violation has been fully documented and locked in the Internet Archive as immutable evidence.

https://discuss.ai.google.dev/t/the-ultimate-proof-google-s-forum-ai-just-doxxed-me-while-summarizing-my-post-about-ai-profiling/168846/3

Google Legal has less than 5 days left before the 30-day NDA deadline expires.

Google AI Developers Forum – 3 Jun 26
Statement on the Contradiction Between Google's Deletion Promises and the...
Gemini API · gemini-api
On May 9, 2026, Google LLC's Legal Department (Attn: Custodian of Records, Mountain View, CA) officially received and signed for my comprehensive Pre-Litigation Demand Letter regarding Case ID: 7-1774000040461. The letter exhaustively documents...

Google AI Developers Forum – 7 May 26
Statement on the Contradiction Between Google's Deletion Promises and the...
Gemini API · gemini-api
ENGLISH VERSION Statement on the Contradiction Between Google's Deletion Promises and the Actual Technical Behavior of the Gemini System This written submission documents the discrepancy between the deletion functionality described in Google's official documentation...
Reading time: 8 mins · Likes: 1

Internet Archive
Fire Shot Capture 147 Statement On The Contradiction Between Google's...
FireShot Capture 147 - Statement on the Contradiction Between Google's Deletion Promises a_ - [discuss.ai.google.dev

445 views · 3 links · 9 min read · Summarize

Share · Bookmark · Flag · Reply

Watching · You will receive notifications because you created this topic.

Suggested · Related

Topic	Replies	Views	Activity
Did Google AI Studio silently change safety filtering today? Full responses now get erased instead of stopping generation – this breaks creative writing and RP (13) Google AI Studio · bug, ai-studio, gemini, feedback, safety	240	6.6k	17h
File Search uploadToFileSearchStore returns 500 INTERNAL on paid billing account (works on free tier) Gemini API · billing	1	5	1h
Anybody succeeding in making Gemini say something before calling functions? Gemini API	0	5	3h
Account restricted from generating AIza API keys — only generating AQ. tokens Gemini API	0	7	3h
Error presented on 01.06.2026 Gemini API · api	4	94	3h

There are 2 unread and 94 new topics remaining, or browse other topics in Gemini API